

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-9, 11-17, 19-22, and 24-32 are currently pending in the application. Of these claims, claims 1, 15, 20, and 29 are independent.

### **Claim 23 Renumbering**

This application was filed with two different claims numbered as claim 23 and no claim 24. Applicant has amended the second occurrence of claim 23 to be claim 24.

### **Rejections**

Claims 1, 14-15, 20, and 23 (second occurrence which is now claim 24) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,614,206 B1 to Wong et al. ("Wong").

Claims 2-10, 16, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of U.S. Patent 6,774,604 B2 to Matsuda et al. ("Matsuda").

Claims 11-13, 19, and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong in view of U.S. Patent 6,531,845 B2 to Kerai et al. ("Kerai").

Claims 17-18, 22, 23 (first occurrence), and 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong.

Claims 29-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wong, Matsuda, Kerai, and Applicant's admitted prior art ("AAPA").

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections as follows.

Because claims 10, 18, and 23 (first occurrence) have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Applicant respectfully submits the rejections of these claims are no longer applicable.

Independent claim 1 recites transferring power through an inductive coupling charge transmitter to receiving devices. Independent claims 15 and 20 recite a charge transfer interface that includes an inductive coupling charge transmitter.

The Office Action on page 5 at lines 1-4 states in connection with the rejection of now canceled claim 10:

Applicant's numerous definitions of how the computer system transfers power to the devices (through a USB cable or through an inductive coupling charge transmitter) is construed to be an admission that the criticality does not reside in how the computer system transfers power to the devices and hence are obvious variations of one another.

The Office Action on page 6 at lines 5-8 similarly asserts this position in connection with the rejections of now canceled claims 18 and 23 (first occurrence).

The Office Action appears to be relying on equivalence as a rationale to support these obviousness rejections. The Office Action, however, does not show any equivalency that is recognized in the prior art but instead relies on Applicant's own disclosure. Applicant respectfully submits such reliance on Applicant's disclosure constitutes an impermissible use of hindsight. See, e.g., MPEP § 2144.06.

Independent claim 29 recites transfer of power from a power supply through an inductive coupling charge transmitter to different types of receiving devices.

The Office Action on page 8 at lines 2-6 states:

\* \* \* However, as shown by AAPA, inductive coupling charge transmitters are well known in the art [page 5, paragraph 0022]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a well known inductive coupling charge transmitter as the charge transmitter in the Wong, Matsuda and Kerai system to eliminate the need to carry to carry cables for each device to connect to the system.

Applicant respectfully submits, however, that this conclusion of obviousness is impermissibly based on hindsight as having been drawn only after reading Applicant's own disclosure. Applicant respectfully notes that Applicant's disclosure did not admit that use of an inductive coupling charge transmitter is recognized in the prior art as an equivalent to use of a USB cable to transfer power to different types of receiving devices. Applicant also respectfully submits that the motivation or suggestion to use an inductive coupling charge transmitter "in the Wong, Matsuda and Kerai system to eliminate the need [] to carry cables" does not stem from the prior art but rather only became apparent after reading Applicant's own disclosure.

Noting the remaining rejected claims depend from independent claim 1, 15, 20, or 29, Applicant therefore respectfully submits these rejections have been overcome and should accordingly be withdrawn.

Note that there may be additional reasons for the patentability of claims. For example, there may be additional reasons why the dependent claims are patentable.

It is respectfully submitted this patent application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned to help expedite the prosecution of this patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 15, 2006

/Matthew C. Fagan, Reg. No. 37,542/  
Matthew C. Fagan  
Registration No. 37,542  
Telephone: (512) 732-3936  
Facsimile: (512) 732-3912 (please call first)

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, L.L.P.  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard, Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
Telephone: (503) 439-8778  
Telephone: (310) 207-3800